

## Appendix B. Project Chronology

### 2003

#### January

- ❑ Contacted 65 entities (national, regional and statewide arts and cultural service organizations, grantmakers, and local arts agencies) for use of their databases. Request yielded 44 databases totaling 11,660 names from which the master database was developed.
- ❑ Mailed 156 letters through the California Assembly of Local Arts Agencies (CALAA) to local arts agencies distributing study information to their constituents and requesting use of databases.
- ❑ Made study presentations at statewide arts organization meetings.

#### February

- ❑ Sought organizational data from 10 organizations located in the study's seven targeted metropolitan areas: Fresno, Los Angeles, Oakland, Sacramento, San Diego, San Francisco and San Jose. Received responses from seven of ten organizations (Los Angeles city and county, San Diego, San Francisco granting and arts council, San Jose city and county).
- ❑ Shared project promotion with the California Arts Council's infrastructure group: Association of CA Museums, California Assembly of Local Arts Agencies, and Alliance for California Traditional Arts, Association of California Symphony Orchestras, and other arts related groups.
- ❑ Presented project information to the Arts Marketing Institute (AMI) consultants. Added AMI questions to project's audience inquiry.

#### March

- ❑ Continued field updates to all statewide arts service organizations.
- ❑ Continued database solicitation.
- ❑ Continued promotional presentations in San Francisco, Oakland, and Los Angeles.
- ❑ Developed survey instruments for organizations, schools and audiences.
- ❑ Formed project advisory committee.

#### April

- ❑ Vetted survey instruments with field representatives.
- ❑ Conferred with rural local arts agencies to clarify definitions of "rural" subsets in the study.
- ❑ Designed project materials.
- ❑ Secured and/or purchased databases from 44 organizations.
- ❑ Recruited advisory committee members.

#### May - Public launch

- ❑ Finalized all survey instrument content.
- ❑ Secured Spanish translation for postcard and audience and organizational surveys.
- ❑ Built and tested website to receive organizational data.
- ❑ Established contact information for Spanish-speaking organizations.
- ❑ Finalized survey taxonomy (criteria) with California Arts Council (CAC).
- ❑ Vetted 11,600 organization data files according to taxonomy.

- ❑ Finalized 3,200 survey sample
- ❑ Mailed 3,200 postcards to organizational survey sample announcing project and inviting organizations to provide information online.
- ❑ Recruited advisory committee members.

#### June

- ❑ Activated website to receive organizational information.
- ❑ Established and promoted website links (San Francisco Grants for the Arts, Los Angeles Arts Commission, City of San Diego Commission for Arts and Culture, California Assembly of Local Arts Agencies, and San Jose Arts Commission.) Others unknown to the Project Team may have provided links.
- ❑ Mailed 3,200 surveys to organizational survey sample.
- ❑ Recruited advisory committee members.

#### July - August

- ❑ Sent 44 database providers rosters of their constituents selected to participate in the study with promotional information encouraging responses.
- ❑ Began calls and emails to organizations encouraging responses.
- ❑ Posted survey reminders on CALAA and CAC websites.
- ❑ Randomly selected organizations for audience surveys and began solicitation.
- ❑ Finalized school survey sample with Department of Education assistance.

#### September

- ❑ Continued field updates via email blasts.
- ❑ Continued calls and emails to organizations encouraging organizational responses.
- ❑ Continued calls to organizations to secure agreement for audience surveying.
- ❑ Mailed surveys to 700 schools with Department of Education assistance.
- ❑ Entered organizational data as received.

#### October

- ❑ Retooled methodology – extended all deadlines to boost response rates
- ❑ Expanded phone team personnel and continued direct phone contact encouraging organizations to respond.
- ❑ Continued field updates via email blasts.
- ❑ Updated 44 database providers of extended deadlines.
- ❑ Continued calls to organizations to secure agreement for audience surveying.
- ❑ Collected and entered data.

#### November

- ❑ Retooled methodology – extended all deadlines to boost response rates and did a second mailing to 2,900 non-respondents in the 3,200 organization survey sample.
- ❑ Continued project team calls – direct phone contact encouraging organizations to respond.
- ❑ Continued field updates via email blasts.
- ❑ Updated 44 database providers of extended deadlines.
- ❑ Continued calls to organizations to secure agreement for audience surveying.
- ❑ Collected and entered school and organizational data.
- ❑ Prepared and vetted foundation surveys.

## December

- ❑ Retooled methodology – extended all deadlines to boost response rates.
- ❑ Emailed foundation inquiries.
- ❑ Expanded phone team personnel (again) and continued direct phone contact encouraging organizations to respond.
- ❑ Continued field updates via email blasts.
- ❑ Updated 44 database providers of extended deadlines.
- ❑ Continued calls to organizations to secure agreement for audience surveying.
- ❑ Collected and entered data.

## **2004**

### January

- ❑ Retooled methodology – extended all deadlines to boost response rates.
- ❑ Resent school surveys to non-respondents in the 700 sample.
- ❑ Placed an aggregate 3,400+ calls to organizations encouraging survey and audience responses.
- ❑ Chased down final audience survey results.
- ❑ Synthesized data – shared preliminary results with CAC.

### February

- ❑ Closed data window February 1.
- ❑ Chased down final audience survey results.
- ❑ Continued data synthesis.
- ❑ Generated research results and report drafts.

### March

- ❑ Produced study.